

*REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**Present Invention and Pending Claims*

Claims 1 and 3-14 are pending and are directed to a porous membrane. The porous membrane of the present invention as defined by the pending claims comprises a specific polyamide as a main material and is characterized by improved hot water resistance. Accordingly, the porous membrane of the present invention is industrially significant and particularly useful as a medical separation membrane suitable for AC sterilization.

Amendments to the Claims

The claims have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the present invention. More specifically, the subject matter of claim 2 has been incorporated into independent claim 1. As such, claim 2 has been canceled, and claim 5 has been amended to recite dependence upon claim 1. No new matter has been added by way of these amendments.

Summary of the Office Action

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 4, 10, 11, 13, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent 4,935,141 (Buck et al.). The Examiner also rejected claims 1, 9-11, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent 4,217,227 (Effert et al.). Additionally, claims 8 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly containing obvious subject matter over U.S. Patent 4,935,141 (Buck et al.) in view of U.S. Patent 5,006,247 (Dennison et al.).

According to the Examiner, claims 2 and 5-7 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. The Examiner acknowledged that claims 2 and 5-7 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the claims they depend upon.

Reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

Discussion of the Anticipation and Obviousness Rejections

Claims 1, 3, 4, 9-11, 13, and 14 were rejected as anticipated by the Buck reference and/or the Effert reference. Claims 8 and 12 were rejected as obvious over the Buck reference in view of the Dennison reference.

Claim 2 was not rejected as anticipated by or obvious over any of the cited references. More specifically, none of the cited references discloses or suggests a polyamide which comprises a dicarboxylic acid component comprising 60-100 mol% of terephthalic acid and a diamine component comprising 60-100 mol% of 1,9-nonenediamine and/or 2-methyl-1,8-octanediamine.

As indicated above, the feature of claim 2 has been incorporated into claim 1 and, therefore, all of the claims dependent thereon, namely, all of the other pending claims. Accordingly, the anticipation and obviousness rejections have been rendered moot and should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that the patent application is in condition for allowance. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



John Kilyk, Jr., Reg. No. 30,763
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAXER, LTD.
Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900
180 North Stetson Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6731
(312) 616-5600 (telephone)
(312) 616-5700 (facsimile)

Date: December 4, 2007